

CONCORDIA UNIVERSITY

Council of the Faculty of Arts and Science

Minutes of the Meeting held on Friday, May 8, 1992

Present: G. Valaskakis; M. Yates; B. Harris; P. Bird; S. Carter; F. Stevens; C. Foster; J. Appleby; P. Widden; M. Brian; R. Pallen; E. Preston; G. Kanaan; B. Lewis; G. Fisher; W. Knitter; G. Auchinachie; J. Woodsworth; W. Sellers; S. Kumarapeli; G. Decarie; L. Crysler; C. Levy; J. Locke; P. Allen; W. Byers; A. Teffeteller; C. Gray; R. Sharma; N. Segalowitz; I. Robinson; M. Ainley; S. Hoecker-Drysdale; G. Newsham; C. Potworowski; J. Snyder; K. Clement; M. Innes; D. Parent.

Regrets: M. Mendell; J. Anderson.

Absent: J. Lightstone; M. Kusy; J. Gavin; H. McQueen; J. Fiset; M. Poirier; M. Pruska-Carroll; J. Vidmar; J.F. Plamondon; D. Awasti; K. Beaudoin; E. Brown; E. Chan; S. Desjardins; H. Halsall; D. Haufschild; A. Leonhardt; B. Leonhardt; C. McManaman; C. Nero; G. Pahinis; P. Toone.

Guests: P. Calce.

Documents Distributed and Considered at this Meeting:

- | | |
|--------------|---|
| ASFC 92-4M-A | Notice of Elections/Ratification - Arts and Science Faculty Committees |
| ASFC 92-4M-B | Procedural Guidelines for Periodic Appraisal of Academic Units |
| ASFC 92-4M-C | Schedule of Appraisals, Faculty of Arts and Science (for information) |
| ASFC 92-4M-D | Mandate for Arts and Science Faculty Council Committee to Propose Nominations for Honourary Degrees |
| ASFC 92-4M-E | December Course Change |

1. Call to Order

Dr. Valaskakis called the meeting to order at 10:12 a.m.

2. Approval of Agenda

Dr. Valaskakis asked that the Agenda be amended; moving Item 10 to Item 7 so that Mr. Donald Chambers, Senior Advisor and Registration Coordinator for the Faculty of Arts and Science who was present to speak to this item could leave as soon as possible to attend another meeting.

92-4M-1 It was moved and seconded (Kumarapeli/Knitter) that the Agenda be approved as amended.

Carried.

3. Approval of Minutes of March 20, 1992

92-4M-2 It was moved and seconded (Stevens/Robinson) that the minutes of the Arts and Science Faculty Council meeting held Friday, March 20, 1992 be approved as circulated.

Carried.

4. Remarks from the Chair

Dr. Valaskakis reminded Council that Convocation for the Faculty of Arts and Science would be held on June 3, 1992, with both morning and afternoon ceremonies. She urged Council members to attend and to encourage colleagues to attend.

Dr. Valaskakis announced that the Faculty would be holding a Chairs' Retreat at the Gault Estate on Thursday, May 14, 1992. She asked Council members, who were not Chairs to pass on the information that the Victoria Bridge Southbound was closed during the morning rush-hour.

Dr. Valaskakis announced that the Office of the Vice Rector, Institutional Relations and Finance had recently distributed a Report on Multiculturalism. Copies of the report could be obtained from that office.

Dr. Valaskakis also announced that the University Status of Women's Office had prepared an Action Plan. Copies of the plan and information about it should be directed to that office.

Dr. Valaskakis said that the Senate Committee on Academic Planning and Priorities (SCAPP) had held a number of meetings about the provisional budget. The Faculty Deans had been meeting on a regular basis and had made a strong statement about three issues which they felt were not included in the provisional budget. The first was employment equity and its effect on the salary budget. The second area of concern was the additional costs of the Appraisals which were not reflected in the budget; these costs would now be reimbursed. The third issue was the School of Graduate Studies which was a University priority and yet no additional funding was allotted to the School. At the insistence of the Deans, and the Vice Rector, Academic there was an increase in the School's budget in recognition of this priority.

Dr. Valaskakis mentioned to Council that the Deans were working very hard to change the university's budget process. They would meet with the Vice Rector, Institutional Relations and Finance as a group together with the Vice Rector, Academic to discuss budget issues rather than meet separately, as had been done in the past. University and faculty priorities would be dealt with as a whole and negotiations would take place before meeting with the Vice Rector, Institutional Relations and Finance so that university priorities would be addressed.

5. Questions and Announcements

Mr. Parent raised a question concerning the Agenda. He was disturbed that the Agenda had been drawn up by Steering Committee during the Examination period. He assumed that bodies such as Faculty Councils with student members would not operate as students would not be able to attend due to exams. He said that students in Arts and Science were unable to put forward a proposal because Steering Committee met during exams. He felt that Steering Committee should not meet during exams and that students should have been made aware of the fact that, Steering Committee would meet during this period.

Dr. Valaskakis informed Mr. Parent that the schedule of both Council and Steering Committee meetings was circulated at the beginning of the academic year. Council could not afford to postpone its meetings during the examination period. She recognized the difficulty for students, but pointed out that the university's business must continue. Dr. Valaskakis also pointed out that an April meeting of Council was not scheduled because of the busy time for students and faculty at the end of term and beginning the examination period. She also noted that one of the two students on Steering Committee, Mr. Awasti had attended the Steering Committee meeting. Council was very grateful for his presence. Dr. Valaskakis reminded Council that Steering Committee would meet at 1:30 p.m. on May 13th. The Council Meeting scheduled for May 22 was a Graduation Meeting but Steering Committee would also consider any other items of business

that came before it in writing.

Dr. Knitter referred to a document circulated by Vice Rector Cohen outlining a new university policy on salary review. As a consequence there was no mechanism now available by which a faculty member could request a salary review on the basis of equity. Dr. Knitter asked the Dean to comment on this document.

Dr. Valaskakis responded that there was a policy issued by the Vice Rector, Institutional Relations and Finance in regard to review and assessment of salary for faculty members. If a member of faculty had an official offer from another university at a higher salary, it was likely that the salary would be met. She felt that it was a limited and unfortunate approach to the issue but noted that there was an important rationale behind this policy. One reason was the freezing of salaries by the provincial government for a six-month period. Thus, salary increases would be very difficult to justify to the government. The university had just completed a very complex, and in her opinion, valuable, equity process. The university had reviewed salaries of female faculty and adjusted those. In response to that, a great many other faculty members felt that their salaries should be reviewed. On a large scale, this would throw out the effect of the equity process. In cases where faculty members were very concerned that their salaries were very out of line, she would advise them to ask for an assessment anyway. She would request a salary review for those faculty members but she could not request a salary increase if it was shown that they should in fact receive one at this time because of this policy. She did not feel that the policy would last forever but would encourage Council members and Chairs to pass the information on to their colleagues.

Dr. Byers asked if the criteria of market conditions would no longer be applicable unless the person actually had a job offer in hand. The Chairs' Caucus was told by Dr. Cohen that there was a differential in the rate in which positions came back to departments. Normally positions came back at 10% above the floor but in certain areas, due to market conditions, salaries would come back at up to 50% above the floor of Assistant Professor. Was that latter policy still in place and if so, wouldn't that be inconsistent with the new policy of refusing to consider market conditions.

Dr. Valaskakis said that the latter policy was in place and it had never gone up to 50% except in a few areas. As she understood it, salary could only be tied to market conditions if another offer was in hand. She agreed that it was a very difficult policy.

Dr. Byers said that, under this policy, a faculty member must strike a good deal on first coming to Concordia. If market conditions came into play a year or so

after they were hired, they would be unable to request a salary review or increase.

Dr. Valaskakis said that at the present time, that was indeed correct.

6. Notice of Elections/Ratification - Arts and Science Faculty Committees

Dr. Valaskakis asked that Council members submit their nominations to Steering Committee by 1:30 p.m. on May 13, 1992.

7. December Course Change

Dr. Valaskakis asked for speaking privileges for Mr. Donald Chambers, there were no objections.

Dr. Carter introduced Mr. Chambers. As Registration Coordinator, his principal responsibility was trouble-shooting. He had attended every registration period since September. Dr. Carter referred to the summary of 1991/92 Arts and Science Fall/Winter Registration and Course Change Schedule, especially the December 4 and 5 days of Course Change. These were the two days to which her remarks referred.

The December course change was initiated in 1984 to enable students already enrolled to take places before new students starting in January filled the courses. Her office was suggesting that the two days in December were no longer serving that purpose and could be cancelled. When students came to course change in September, the sections put on for January were not available for them. Last January a total of 11 courses were put on specifically for January-entry students. These courses were not available during December course change. The only places available were those left from the September course change period. This led to high levels of frustration. In addition, when students came to December course change, their marks from the first term were not available and therefore they did not know if they had the required pre-requisite. Because of the time of year, departmental advisors were frequently not available. Another problem was that students were in the middle of examinations or final papers and already under a great deal of stress because of that. They came under pressure to course change, only to find that they must return in January during the 7 days of course change.

92-4M-3

It was moved and seconded (Carter/Knitter) that the Faculty of Arts and Science cancel the two days of Course Change in December and have only the seven days of Course Change following the January Registration period.

Dr. Auchinachie asked whether this move was in answer to the advertising for January entry and fear of losing credibility with the CEGEPs.

Mr. Chambers said that we had always had January entry. He said that students already enroled at Concordia had had early registration and course change in March, May, June, August and September.

Dr. Byers stressed that the pre-requisite issue was germane with respect to Mathematics' students. This was a major academic reason for Council to support this motion.

Professor Brian said that when a student registered in September for a January course they were billed in September. This was a financial strain for students and was perhaps one of the reasons that returning students registered during the December and January course change period. She wondered whether anything could be negotiated with Accounts so that students were charged for January courses only in January.

Dr. Valaskakis thanked Professor Brian for her suggestion and promised to follow it up.

Professor Brian asked if other issues pertaining to registration could be discussed in the fall.

Dr. Valaskakis agreed that they could.

Carried.

Dr. Hoecker-Drysdale asked Mr. Chambers if he anticipated in the future that we could organize a better registration schedule. She wondered if the March registration could be worked around student's schedules so that they did not miss classes during this important time.

Mr. Chambers responded that the former Vice Rector, Services, Dr. Giguere said in December that telephone registration was being taken off the back burner and looked at seriously. The University was hoping to have telephone registration in effect within two years. Regarding March registration, any student could present their point to either Registrar's Services or himself and have their appointment time changed.

Dr. Valaskakis asked that concerns or notices of motion regarding Registration be brought to Steering Committee for a fall meeting of Council.

Mr. Parent asked whether other questions for Mr. Chambers could be raised as he was present at this meeting.

Dr. Valaskakis responded that Mr. Chambers could be invited to attend another meeting of Council.

8. Procedural Guidelines for Periodic Appraisal of Academic Units

Dr. Valaskakis asked for speaking privileges for Dr. Barbara MacKay, Associate Vice Rector, Academic. There were no objections.

Dr. Valaskakis mentioned that at the last Senate meeting, Dr. MacKay had brought this document forward. Because Arts and Science Faculty Council had expressed its wish to discuss academic matters before they were voted upon by Senate, Dr. Valaskakis had had it tabled so that Council could have an opportunity to discuss it.

She noted that this document had been discussed at other Faculty Councils and at Chairs' Caucus. She thanked Dr. MacKay for being present and for the opportunity to have a discussion.

Dr. Stevens introduced Dr. MacKay to Council.

92-4M-4

It was moved and seconded (Stevens/Hoecker-Drysdale) that the Arts and Science Faculty Council accept for discussion the Procedural Guidelines for Periodic Appraisal of Academic Units.

Mr. Parent asked if we were discussing an item which had been passed at Senate and not discussed at Council.

Dr. Valaskakis said she had just spoken to that very issue.

Dr. Decarie said that he was sitting on one of these Appraisals Committees at the present time. Under the present procedures, there were people within the discipline who would ensure what the department was doing with respect to the discipline and there were people from outside the discipline who would accept what it was doing although clearly it was not up to the standards of their discipline. All of the focus was on the discipline; there was no provision anywhere in the process for the input of someone whose primary field was

education. The majority of Faculty members were not training people to become specialists within their own discipline. The result was that there was a need for someone to look at departments, to determine whether what they were doing was within any kind of conformity with any educational principles or whether there were educational matters to be looked at. It was not just a disciplinary matter, it was a matter of the learning process within a department. This document did not appear to provide for that.

Dr. MacKay responded that the issue of who was on the Appraisal Committee had been widely discussed. For example, in the Faculty of Commerce and Administration, their Faculty Council wanted to make recommendations for changes in the composition of the Appraisal Committee and its terms of reference. There a statement in the Senate document which said that the university should provide all the support it could to this process and that included administrative support. Up to now, academic units had not been able to get this support but she hoped that a package would be available from Institutional Planning Office for all programs being appraised with a great deal of data available to the academic unit including a standardized questionnaire which would bring these issues to the surface.

Dr. Mackay said that during discussions at other Faculty Councils and at the Chair's Caucus, a number of points had arisen. Some minor changes would be made to the procedures as a result of those discussions and these would be going to Senate's Steering Committee the following week.

She advised Council of one change to be made on Page 2 of the document, in the composition of the Committee, the phrase "from a list nominated by the unit" would be changed to "nominated by the unit".

As well, student associations had asked that the phrase "relevant student associations" be changed to read "1 to 2 student(s) nominated by relevant student associations to include one undergraduate student and where appropriate, one graduate student."

Another clarification requested concerned cases where a unit offered graduate programmes or where it was considering the development of graduate programmes, the Dean of Graduate Studies, in consultation with the Dean of the Faculty, would recommend two of the Committee members from the first "two" categories as listed below (not "three").

Dr. MacKay noted, another concern that was raised at the Board of Graduate Studies, that within the overall category of "rationale" that tolerance for diversity (which is part of the University Mission Statement) be included as well as the need for equity. She also pointed to the need to address teaching processes there.

Mr. Parent wished to address the student composition of these appraisal committees. Two students nominated by the relevant student associations, were to be included. He knew from experience as President of the History Students' Association, that numbers speak loudly. He felt that the student composition should be two undergraduate students and one graduate students.

Dr. Byers asked how the three faculty members from other disciplines within or outside the Faculty would be chosen.

Dr. MacKay said that they would be chosen by the Dean of the Faculty in consultation with the Unit. The Dean of Graduate Studies would recommend two of the four (where appropriate) in consultation with the Dean of the Faculty. The particular culture of the Unit would also be considered. For example, the Department of Theatre might find it useful to have a member from the Department of English on that committee.

Ms. Clement asked whether anything from the Enhancement and Recognition of Teaching would be used in the analysis. She also wondered whether the final report from that Committee was completed, and asked if it would be possible for members of Council to receive a copy of the report.

Dr. MacKay said that, copies could be requested. She expected that the Report and its recommendations would be brought to Councils and Senate in September/October. Whatever recommendations were accepted from that Report may have an impact on the Appraisal process.

Dr. Auchinachie asked about the expenses of the appraisal. He said that the English Department had four programs and the appraisal of these would be an enormous undertaking. He asked about the possibility of remission for faculty members who took on this task.

Dr. Valaskakis said that the intention was to pay for the expenses, of the external consultant and the costs of questionnaires. There was no intention of providing course remissions for this task. She recognized the large and difficult task involved in an Appraisal; however, the provision of a kit from the Office of Institutional Planning would be a great help. Also the faculty member who took on the task of Appraisals should not be asked to do other departmental or university committee work during that year.

Dr. Gray questioned Dr. MacKay's response to Ms. Clement's question about whether the Appraisal Report was available for scrutiny. He wished to know to whom exactly would the report be shown.

Dr. MacKay said that the report from the Committee on the Enhancement and

Recognition of Teaching at Concordia would be submitted to the university for discussion.

Dr. Byers noted that normally graduate programs were appraised individually, usually spaced about two or three years apart. This has been a major task for his department of Mathematics and Statistics. Now both graduate and undergraduate programs were to be appraised at the same time. In addition there was the service role to the university, all to be done in the same year making it an incredible task. He could not imagine one or even two faculty members taking on this task as well as their teaching and research duties without remission. He emphasized that these appraisals were extremely costly and the first cost was the time and energy that went into undertaking them.

Dr. Valaskakis acknowledged Dr. Byers' concern.

Dr. Decarie said that as he understood it, we were undertaking this task for the Committee on Enhancement and Recognition of Teaching.

Dr. MacKay said that the Committee for Enhancement and Recognition of Teaching was a sub-committee of the Academic Planning Committee which was itself a sub-committee of Senate. This committee was preparing a report which would make recommendations to Senate after consultation with Councils. Those recommendations might include structures or priorities to be dealt with by departments which might impact on the Appraisal process. The appraisals were not being completed for the Committee for the Enhancement and Recognition of Teaching.

Dr. Teffeteller and Dr. Ainley both wished to voice their concerns about the resource implications of the appraisal process, especially on smaller units.

Dr. Knitter said that the Chairs' Caucus felt encouraged by the Vice Rector, Academic's willingness to take their concerns into account. This process would take an enormous amount of time and as the procedures became more formalized, more time would be spent on these documents. Departments must make the most of this process for themselves. If we looked at the experiences of the past, many recommendations which had budgetary consideration were not acted upon because the monies just was not there. How were we going to keep control of these appraisals, yet balance the real costs of recommendations.

Professor Preston asked whether one of the outside faculty members should be a Chair because of the importance that the Chair had in academic matters in a department.

Dr. Valaskakis noted the concern, but pointed out that Chairs who already felt overworked would not welcome another commitment.

Professor Brian said that her unit had undergone appraisal and it was necessary for one of her offices to close for ten days in order to complete the work. It took an enormous amount of time.

Dr. Lewis felt that the administration should follow through with course remissions and support if the appraisal process was that important.

Dr. Valaskakis expressed her understanding of the concerns brought forward but reminded Council that, it would be a very expensive route for the University to take and it would cut into part-time sections or LTA's because the money had to come from somewhere.

She added that she had just returned from a meeting of Canadian Deans of Arts, Humanities and Science and Quebec universities were in a very safe and privileged position compared to the rest of Canada, especially in regard to workload and resources. For instance, the University of Toronto cut back 37 positions in one Faculty. Council must recognize that remissions could not be created out of the air.

Carried: 26 in favour, 2 opposed, 3 abstentions

Dr. Valaskakis thanked Dr. MacKay for coming to Council to answer the questions raised.

8. Schedule of Appraisals, Faculty of Arts and Science

Dr. Levy pointed out that all units had the degree beside them except for the Colleges.

Dr. Stevens responded that not all of the Colleges had their own program. She would add those that had been forgotten and urged Council members to bring omissions to her attention.

Dr. Potworowski asked why Theology was not on the schedule for 1992/93.

Dr. Stevens responded that the Chair of Theology kept changing his mind about being appraised in 1992/93 or 1993/94 so she had made the decision to put them in 1993/94. She could change them back to 1992/93 if they so wished.

Dr. Stevens said she would send out a revised list, once all departments had contacted her.

Dr. Sellers said that his department had been appraised this year and the external consultant had remarked that the appraisal process should be a seven-year cycle. It took a year to get feedback and address it within the department; another year to put through changes based on the recommendations; and then an additional three years before the first student graduated under the revised program just before gearing up for the next appraisal.

Dr. Stevens said that they would take this point into consideration.

Dr. Robinson asked how those programs which were shared between two departments would be appraised.

Dr. Stevens said that the answer would be to appraise all departments of shared programs within the same year. Hopefully, the schedule could be arranged to accommodate these programs.

Dr. Pallen recommended that when a committee was struck to look at a department that the committee be given a package. He thought that library facilities, space, equipment and teaching evaluations should be included.

Dr. Valaskakis thought that was an excellent idea for Dr. Stevens to take into account.

Dr. Sellers suggested that guidelines should be established for the external consultant. His external examiner was unsure of his mandate before coming to Concordia.

Dr. Valaskakis thanked Dr. Sellers for that extremely useful idea and promised to follow through on it.

Dr. Widden emphasized that a five-year schedule was very short. He wished to know where the Diploma of Ecotoxicology would fall.

Dr. Stevens said that Biology and Chemistry were to be appraised in the same year and therefore it would be natural for that program to be appraised at the same time

10. Mandate for Arts and Science Faculty Council Committee to Propose Nominees for Honourary Degrees

- 92-4M-5 It was moved and seconded (Hoecker-Drysdale/Byers) that the rationale, composition and mandate for the Arts and Science Faculty Council Committee to Propose Nominees for Honourary Degrees be approved.

Dr. Segalowitz asked about the composition of the committee, he wished Psychology to be with the sciences rather than with the arts. He wished "arts" to be changed to "humanities"

Dr. Hoecker-Drysdale and Dr. Byers agreed to this amendment.

Dr. Pallen asked that the wording be changed to read, "one faculty member from the Sciences, one from the Social Sciences and one from the Humanities."

Dr. Hoecker-Drysdale said that the composition of the committee had been approved at a previous meeting. This committee, however, was a facilitating committee. Its mandate did not include putting forth nominations to the University Committee, but rather to help departments put nominations forward to Council. She did not feel that representation was an important factor on this committee.

Dr. Pallen said that if that were so, why specify sciences and humanities at all.

Dr. Valaskakis said that it was not necessary but wanted to avoid having two members from the same department serve.

Dr. Pallen said that he felt strongly enough to request this amendment. When names were put in order to go to the Graduation Ceremonies Committee it was important to have a committee member to argue each nomination.

- 92-4M-6 It was moved and seconded (Pallen/Widden) that the committee's composition be three faculty members - one from the Sciences, one from the Social Sciences and one from the Arts and one student.

Dr. Hoecker-Drysdale reiterated that this committee was not expected to prioritize nominees. Its mandate was to put nominations forward from departments to this Council for approval, before being forwarded to the Graduation Ceremonies Committee.

Dr. Pallen said that a committee of four could put nominees in an efficient order for Council. He still wished his motion to stand.

Mr. Parent asked that two student representatives be included, one undergraduate and one graduate.

Dr. Pallen and Dr. Widden agreed.

Dr. Valaskakis reminded Council that the composition of the committee had been approved at a previous Council meeting. What had not been approved was the mandate for the Committee.

Dr. Auchinachie suggested that it should be called a Steering Committee.

Professor Crysler explained that this was a committee to get nominations from departments and it did not matter what section of the faculty members came from.

Dr. Auchinachie said that if it were a Steering Committee he didn't mind the rationale. However, if it were a regular committee he would prefer if the priority of the points under "rationale" be re-arranged.

Dr. Hoecker-Drysdale said that this was not a Steering Committee, we already had a Steering Committee for Council. She expressed her amazement and fascination by the interest being shown by Council on this issue. In the past it had been very apathetic about nominations. She suggested that the Committee be called the Arts and Science Faculty Nomination Committee for Honourary Degrees.

Dr. Byers agreed.

Dr. Decarie called the question.

92-4M-6

It was moved and seconded (Pallen/Widden) that the committee's composition be three faculty members - one from the Sciences, one from the Social Sciences and one from the Arts and two students, one undergraduate and one graduate.

Defeated: 14 in favour; 15 opposed; 2 abstentions.

92-4M-5

It was moved and seconded (Hoecker-Drysdale/Byers) that the rationale, composition and mandate for the Arts and Science Faculty Council Nominations Committee for Honourary Degrees be approved.

Carried: 1 opposed, 2 abstentions.

11. Other Business

Dr. Auchinachie requested clarification from the Chair of Council that the criteria for emeritus status at this university has been changed. He understood that the original emeritus provisions were passed by Senate in 1987 and therefore, any change would have to come before Senate. Since Arts and Science had procedures for the appointment of Professor Emeritus, which involved the department, the FPC, and then on higher up, he wished to know if there were plans to change this procedure.

Dr. Valaskakis said that Professor Emeritus was a university distinction for which a description and guidelines were passed by Senate. There had been no change to those. In those guidelines there was no procedural process other than that it was an appointment at the university level. A Professor Emeritus was not within the bargaining unit because that professor had "graduated" from the university. Professor Emeritus came out of a response to a number of faculty members who were left without a rank once they had retired and could not attend conferences and give papers as a *bonafide* Professor. This had been addressed by giving professors the title of Adjunct Professor. There was no cost to the university and she was personally committed to the opening up of this title as she was to opening up the rank of Full Professor. The rules from Senate did not outline a departmental or even a faculty-level process. It was recommended by the Dean's Committee from the office of the Vice Rector Academic.

12. Graduation Meeting - Friday, May 22, 1992 at 9:00 a.m.

Dr. Valaskakis reminded Council that the next meeting of Council would be to approve the graduation lists and a quorum was especially important.

13. Adjournment

92-4M-7 It was moved and seconded (Clement/Potworowski) that the meeting be adjourned at 11:18 a.m.